arXiv:1608.00195v3 [math.OC] 19 Nov 2016

On the Theory and Application of Distributed Asynchronous Optimization over Weakly Coupled Renewal Systems

Xiaohan Wei* **and Michael J. Neely***
e-mail: xiaohanw@usc.edu; mikejneely@gmail.com

Abstract: This paper considers optimization over multiple renewal systems coupled by time average constraints. These systems act asynchronously over variable length frames. When a particular system starts a new renewal frame, it chooses an action from a set of options for that frame. The action determines the duration of the frame, the penalty incurred during the frame (such as energy expenditure), and a vector of performance metrics (such as instantaneous number of job services). The goal is to minimize the time average penalty subject to time average overall constraints on the corresponding metrics. The individual systems are coupled by these constraints. This problem has applications to task processing networks and coupled Markov decision processes (MDPs). We propose a distributed algorithm so that each system can make its own decision after observing a global multiplier that is updated every slot. We show that this algorithm satisfies the desired constraints and achieves $O(\epsilon)$ near optimality with $O(1/\epsilon^2)$ convergence time.

Keywords and phrases: Stochastic programming, Fractional programming, Markov decision processes, Renewal processes.

1. Introduction

Consider N renewal systems that operate over a slotted timeline ($t \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$). The timeline for each system $n \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$ is segmented into back-to-back intervals of time called *renewal frames* (see Fig. 1). The start of each renewal frame for a particular system is called a *renewal time* or simply a *renewal* for that system. The duration of each renewal frame is a random positive integer with distribution that depends on a control action chosen by the system at the start of the frame. The decision at each renewal frame also determines the penalty and a vector of performance metrics during this frame. The systems are coupled by time average constraints placed on these metrics over all systems. The goal is to design a decision strategy for each system so that overall time average penalty is minimized subject to time average constraints. Fig. 1 sketches sample timelines of three parallel renewal systems.



FIG 1. *The sample timelines of three parallel renewal systems.*

*Department of Electrical Engineering, University of Southern California

1.1. Applications

This problem has various applications including task processing networks and coupled ergodic MDPs.

- **Multi-server energy-aware scheduling**: Consider a slotted time system with L classes of jobs and N servers. Jobs of each class arrive randomly and are stored separately. The decision set of each system contains different processing modes that determine the number of jobs to serve for each class and the amount of energy to spend. The renewal frame in this scenario is the time for processing the jobs plus the idle/setup time. The goal is to minimize the time average overall energy consumption subject to the constraint that the time average arrivals of each class is no greater than the time average services. This example was previously discussed in [12] and will be discussed in further details in the application section (Section 6).
- **Coupled ergodic MDPs**: Consider N discrete time Markov decision processes over an infinite horizon. At each state of any individual MDP, depending on the decision, the controller receives a certain amount of reward, incurs corresponding costs and yields certain transition probabilities to other states (see [16] and [3] for more details on MDP theory and related topics). Assume each of the MDPs is ergodic, i.e. there exists a state which is recurrent under any sequence of decisions. A similar assumption was previously introduced in [3] to analyze time averages for MDPs. Then, the renewals for each system can be defined as the revisitation to the renewal state. The goal is to maximize the time average overall reward with constraints on time average overall costs. This problem was previously discussed in [1] as well as [13].

1.2. Challenges and previous approaches

In the scenario of finite state ergodic MDPs with finite action sets, this problem can be solved via a linear program (see [1] and [8] for detailed discussions on formulating MDPs as linear programs). However, this centralized approach becomes intractable as the number of MDPs gets very large. On the other hand, since the action of a particular system determines the frame length and this frame length is part of the optimization objective, existing distributed asynchronous algorithms and analysis (e.g. [4][6][18][15]) are not readily extendable.

Prior works in [13] and [12] consider the same asynchronous renewal optimization problem as the current paper. In [13], the author develops a two stage algorithm but the first stage must be solved offline. In [12] the author develops a fully distributed algorithm under the scenario where all quantities are deterministic functions of the action. The method most similar to that of the current paper is [19], where a fully distributed algorithm is developed so that each subsystem can minimize its own *drift-plus-penalty ratio*. The convergence analysis in [19] exploits the special structure of the problem to bound the constraint violations, which is not easy to generalize. Moreover, the convergence time analysis of the algorithm is not known.

1.3. Other related works

The problem considered in the current paper is a generalization of optimization over a single renewal system. It is shown in [14] that for the single renewal system with finite action set, the problem can be solved (offline) via a linear fractional program. Methods for solving linear fractional programs can be found in [17] and [5]. The *drift-plus-penalty ratio* approach is also developed in [14] and [11] for the single renewal system.

On the other hand, our problem is also related to the multi-server scheduling as is shown in one of the example applications. When assuming proper statistics of the arrivals and/or services, energy optimization problems in multi-server systems can also be treated via queueing theory. Specifically, by assuming both arrivals and services are Poisson distributed, [9] treats the multi-server system as an M/M/k/setup queue and explicitly computes several performance metrics via the renewal reward theorem. By assuming arrivals are Poisson and only one server, [20] and [10] treat the system as a multi-class M/G/1 queue and optimize the average energy consumption via polymatroid optimization.

1.4. Our contributions

The current paper formulates the problem as a constrained stochastic programming (1)-(2), develops a new algorithm that is fully distributed, easy to implement and fully analyzed with convergence as well as convergence time results. Specifically,

- We characterize the fundamental performance region of the coupled systems (Lemma 4.2).
- We prove the $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ near optimality of the proposed algorithm by explicitly constructing a supermartingale and introducing a novel stopping time argument (Section 4.2-4.4).
- We prove the $\mathcal{O}(1/\varepsilon^2)$ convergence time of the proposed algorithm under a mild assumption on the existence of a Lagrange multiplier (Section 5).

Simulation experiments on a multi-server energy-aware scheduling problem also demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed algorithm.

2. Problem Formulation

We use $n = 1, 2, \cdots, N$ to index the systems and use $k = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$ to index the renewals. Let t_k^n be the time slot corresponding to the k-th renewal of n-th system with the convention that $t_0^n = 0$. So at time t_k^n, the n-th system chooses a possibly random decision vector α_k^n in a set $\mathcal{A}^n$ of a vector space. This action determines the distributions of the following random variables:

- The duration of the k-th renewal frame $T_k^n := t_{k+1}^n - t_k^n$, which is a positive integer.
- A vector of performance metrics at each slot of that frame $\mathbf{z}^n[t] := (z_1^n[t],\ z_2^n[t],\ \cdots,\ z_L^n[t])$, $t \in \mathcal{T}_k^n$.
- A penalty incurred at each slot of the frame $y^n[t]$, $t \in \mathcal{T}_k^n$.

Let $\mathcal{T}_k^n$ denote the set of all slots from t_k^n to $t_{k+1}^n - 1$. We assume each system has the *renewal property* that given $\alpha_k^n = \alpha^n \in \mathcal{A}^n$, the random variables T_k^n, $\mathbf{z}^n[t]$ and $y^n[t]$, $t \in \mathcal{T}_k^n$ are independent of the information of all systems from the slots before t_k^n with the following *known* conditional expectations $\mathbb{E}(T_k^n | \alpha_k^n = \alpha^n)$, $\mathbb{E}\Big(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n} y^n[t]\Big| \alpha_k^n = \alpha^n\Big)$ and $\mathbb{E}\Big(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n} \mathbf{z}^n[t]\Big| \alpha_k^n = \alpha^n\Big)$.

In addition, we have an uncontrollable i.i.d. random process $\{\mathbf{d}[t]\}_{t=0}^{\infty} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^L$ which can be observed during each time slot with $d_l := \mathbb{E}(d_l[t])$ unknown to the controller. The expectation of $\mathbf{d}[t]$ often serves as the constraints of corresponding performance metrics. For example, in an energy-aware scheduling problem, $\mathbf{z}^n[t]$ and $\mathbf{d}[t]$ represent a vector of job services and arrivals for difference classes, respectively, and the constraints are that the time average service is no less than the time average of arrivals for all classes of jobs.

The goal is to minimize the total time average penalty of these N renewal systems subject to L constraints on the total time average constraints on the performance metrics, i.e. we aim to

solve the following optimization problem:

$$\min \quad \limsup_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(y^n[t]) \tag{1}$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \limsup_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(z_l^n[t]) \le d_l, \quad l\in\{1,2,\cdots,L\}. \tag{2}$$

This problem is challenging because these N systems are weakly coupled by the time average constraints (2), yet each of them operates over its own renewal frames. The renewals of different systems do not have to be synchronized and they do no have to occur at the same rate. In Section 3, we will develop an algorithm that does not need the knowledge of $d_l = \mathbb{E}(d_l[t])$ with a provable $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ approximation solution to the problem (1)-(2) with a convergence rate of $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$.

Remark 2.1. *Note that the renewal property ensures that* $\mathbb{E}(T_k^n|\,\alpha_k^n=\alpha^n)$, $\mathbb{E}\Big(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n} y^n[t]\Big|\,\alpha_k^n=\alpha^n\Big)$ *and* $\mathbb{E}\Big(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n} \mathbf{z}^n[t]\Big|\,\alpha_k^n=\alpha^n\Big)$ *are consistent and well-defined for different algorithms. Suppose on the contrary, the controller could infer what is going to happen in the future by looking at the past information, then, depending on whether or not the controller uses this information to choose actions, the probability law of* T_k^n, $\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n} y^n[t]$, *and* $\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n}\mathbf{z}^n[t]$ *given an action could change. Then, given an action* $\alpha_k^n=\alpha^n$, *we could have different values on the conditional expectations.*

Example 1 (Non-renewal system)**.** *Consider a single system where each frame contains exactly one slot. There is an uncontrollable random sequence* $\{\omega[t]\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$ *taking values in* $\{-1,1\}$ *and is revealed slot-by-slot after the action is picked. Suppose the action* $\alpha[t]\in\{-1,1\}$, $y[t]=\omega[t]\alpha[t]$ *and the goal is to minimize* $\limsup_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\mathbb{E}(y[t])$. *Suppose the system knows the whole trajectory of* $\{\omega[t]\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$ *at* $t=0$, *then, consider the following two algorithms of choosing actions:*

- *The controller independently chooses* $-1,1$ *with equal probability. Then, at any slot* t,

$$\mathbb{E}(y[t]\mid\alpha[t]=1)=\mathbb{E}(\omega[t])\cdot\mathbb{E}(\alpha[t]\mid\alpha[t]=1)=\mathbb{E}(\omega[t]).$$

- *Choose* $\alpha[t]=-\omega[t]$. *Then, at any slot* t,

$$\mathbb{E}(y[t]\mid\alpha[t]=1)=-1,$$

  which is in general not equal to $\mathbb{E}(\omega[t])$.

Thus, for non-renewal systems, the conditional expectation given the action is usually not consistent for different algorithms.

2.1. Notation

Throughout the paper, we use superscript $n\in\{1,2,\cdots,N\}$ to index different systems, use the subscript $l\in\{1,2,\cdots,L\}$ to index different constraints and use the subscript k to index the frames. For any vector $\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{R}^d$, the considered norms are $\|\mathbf{x}\|:=\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^d x_i^2}$, $\|\mathbf{x}\|_1:=\sum_{i=1}^d|x_i|$ and $\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty:=\max_i\ |x_i|$.

2.2. Technical assumptions

Throughout the paper, we make the following assumptions.

Assumption 2.1. *The problem (1)-(2) is feasible, i.e. there exists at least one algorithm which satisfies the constraints.*

Assumption 2.2 (boundedness)**.** *For any $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and any $n \in \{1,2,\cdots,N\}$, there exist absolute constants $y_{\max}$, $z_{\max}$ and $d_{\max}$ such that*

$$|y^n[t]| \leq y_{\max}, \quad |z_l^n[t]| \leq z_{\max}, \quad |d_l[t]| \leq d_{\max}, \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}_k^n, \ \forall l \in \{1,2,\cdots,L\}.$$

and $T_k^n \geq 1$, $\forall k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Furthermore, there exists an absolute constant $B \geq 1$ such that for any fixed $\alpha^n \in \mathcal{A}^n$ and any $s \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ for which $Pr(T_k^n \geq s | \alpha_k^n = \alpha^n) > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}\big((T_k^n - s)^2 \big| \ \alpha_k^n = \alpha^n, T_k^n \geq s\big) \leq B. \tag{3}$$

Remark 2.2. *The quantity $T_k^n - s$ is usually referred to as the residual lifetime. In the special case where $s = 0$, (3) gives the uniform second moment bound of the renewal frames as*

$$\mathbb{E}\big((T_k^n)^2 \big| \ \alpha_k^n = \alpha^n\big) \leq B.$$

Note that (3) is satisfied for a large class of problems. In particular, it can be shown to hold under the following three cases:

1. *If the inter-renewal T_k^n is deterministically bounded.*
2. *If the inter-renewal T_k^n is geometrically distributed.*
3. *If each system is a finite state ergodic MDP with a finite action set, where ergodic MDP means the corresponding Markov chain is ergodic under any stationary policy.*

Definition 2.1. *For any $\alpha^n \in \mathcal{A}^n$, let*

$$\widehat{y}^n(\alpha^n) := \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_k^n} y^n[t] \middle| \alpha_k^n = \alpha^n\right), \quad \widehat{z}_l^n(\alpha^n) := \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_k^n} z_l^n[t] \middle| \alpha_k^n = \alpha^n\right),$$

and $\widehat{T}^n(\alpha^n) := \mathbb{E}(T_k^n | \alpha_k^n = \alpha^n)$. Define

$$\widehat{f}^n(\alpha^n) := \widehat{y}^n(\alpha^n)/\widehat{T}^n(\alpha^n),$$
$$\widehat{g}_l^n(\alpha^n) := \widehat{z}_l^n(\alpha^n)/\widehat{T}^n(\alpha^n), \ \forall l \in \{1,2,\cdots,L\},$$

and define $\left(\widehat{f}^n(\alpha^n), \ \widehat{\mathbf{g}}^n(\alpha^n)\right)$ to be a performance vector under the action α^n.

Definition 2.2. *Let $\mathcal{S}^n$ be the convex hull of $\left\{\left(\widehat{y}^n(\alpha^n), \ \widehat{\mathbf{z}}^n(\alpha^n), \ \widehat{T}^n(\alpha^n)\right) : \ \alpha^n \in \mathcal{A}^n\right\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{L+2}$. Define*

$$\mathcal{P}^n := \{(y/T, \ \mathbf{z}/T) : \ (y, \mathbf{z}, T) \in \mathcal{S}^n\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{L+1}$$

as the performance region of system n.

Assumption 2.3. *The set of all performance vectors $\left(\widehat{f}^n(\alpha^n), \ \widehat{\mathbf{g}}^n(\alpha^n)\right)$ over all $\alpha^n \in \mathcal{A}^n$ is compact.*

Remark 2.3. *Note that by Assumption 2.2, $\widehat{y}^n(\alpha^n)$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}^n(\alpha^n)$ in Definition 2.2 are both bounded, and $T_k^n \geq 1$, $\forall k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, thus, the performance region $\mathcal{P}^n$ is also bounded. This fact is crucial for our subsequent analysis.*

3. Algorithm

In this section, we propose a distributed algorithm where each system can make its own decision after observing a global vector of multipliers which is updated using the global information from all systems. We start by defining a vector of virtual queues $\mathbf{Q}[t] := (Q_1[t],\ Q_2[t],\ \cdots,\ Q_L[t])$, which are 0 at $t = 0$ and updated as follows,

$$Q_l[t+1] = \max\left\{Q_l[t] + \sum_{n=1}^{N} z_l^n[t] - d_l[t],\ 0\right\},\ l \in \{1, 2, \cdots, L\}. \tag{4}$$

These virtual queues will serve as global multipliers to control the growth of corresponding resource consumptions.

Then, the proposed algorithm runs as follows via a fixed trade-off parameter $V > 0$:

- At the beginning of k-th frame of system n, the system observes the vector of virtual queues $\mathbf{Q}[t_k^n]$ and makes a decision $\alpha_k^n \in \mathcal{A}^n$ so as to solve the following subproblem:

$$D_k^n := \min_{\alpha^n \in \mathcal{A}^n} \frac{\mathbb{E}\Big(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n}\left(Vy^n[t] + \langle \mathbf{Q}[t_k^n], \mathbf{z}^n[t]\rangle\right)\Big|\ \alpha_k^n = \alpha^n, \mathbf{Q}[t_k^n]\Big)}{\mathbb{E}\big(T_k^n\big|\ \alpha_k^n = \alpha^n, \mathbf{Q}[t_k^n]\big)}. \tag{5}$$

- Update the virtual queue after each slot:

$$Q_l[t+1] = \max\left\{Q_l[t] + \sum_{n=1}^{N} z_l^n[t] - d_l[t],\ 0\right\},\ l \in \{1, 2, \cdots, L\}.$$

Note that using the notation specified in Definition 2.1, we can rewrite (5) in a more concise way as follows:

$$\min_{\alpha^n \in \mathcal{A}^n} V\widehat{f}^n(\alpha^n) + \langle \mathbf{Q}[t_k^n], \widehat{\mathbf{g}}^n(\alpha^n)\rangle,$$

which is a deterministic optimization problem. Then, by the compactness assumption, there always exists a solution to this subproblem.

This algorithm requires knowledge of the conditional expectations associated with the performance vectors $\left(\widehat{f}^n(\alpha^n),\ \widehat{\mathbf{g}}^n(\alpha^n)\right),\ \alpha^n \in \mathcal{A}^n$, but only requires individual systems n to know their own $\left(\widehat{f}^n(\alpha^n),\ \widehat{\mathbf{g}}^n(\alpha^n)\right),\ \alpha^n \in \mathcal{A}^n$, so that centralized knowledge is not assumed. Furthermore, the virtual queue update uses observed $d_l[t]$ and does not require knowledge of distribution or mean of $d_l[t]$.

4. Limiting Performance

For the rest of the paper, the underlying probability space is denoted as the tuple $(\Omega,\ \mathcal{F},\ P)$. Let $\mathcal{F}[t]$ be the system history up until time slot t. Formally, $\{\mathcal{F}[t]\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$ is a filtration with $\mathcal{F}[0] = \{\emptyset, \Omega\}$ and each $\mathcal{F}[t],\ t \geq 1$ is the σ-algebra generated by all random variables from slot 0 to $t-1$.

For the rest of the paper, we always assume Assumption 2.1-2.3 hold without explicitly mentioning them.

4.1. Convexity

The following lemma demonstrates the convexity of $\mathcal{P}^n$ in Definition 2.2.

Lemma 4.1. *The set $\mathcal{P}^n$ specified in Definition 2.2 is convex for any $n \in \{1, 2, \cdots, N\}$.*

Proof. Consider any two points $(f_1, \mathbf{g}_1),\ (f_2, \mathbf{g}_2) \in \mathcal{P}^n$. We aim to show that for any $q \in (0, 1),\ (qf_1 + (1-q)f_2, q\mathbf{g}_1 + (1-q)\mathbf{g}_2) \in \mathcal{P}^n$. Notice that by definition of $\mathcal{P}^n$, there exists $(y_1, \mathbf{z}_1, T_1),\ (y_2, \mathbf{z}_2, T_2) \in \mathcal{S}^n$ such that $f_1 = y_1/T_1,\ \mathbf{g}_1 = \mathbf{z}_1/T_1,\ f_2 = y_2/T_2$, and $\mathbf{g}_2 = \mathbf{z}_2/T_2$. Thus, it is enough to show

$$\left(q\frac{y_1}{T_1} + (1-q)\frac{y_2}{T_2}, q\frac{\mathbf{z}_1}{T_1} + (1-q)\frac{\mathbf{z}_2}{T_2}\right) \in \mathcal{P}^n. \tag{6}$$

To show this, we make a change of variable by letting $p = \frac{qT_2}{(1-q)T_1+qT_2}$. It is obvious that $p \in (0, 1)$. Furthermore, $q = \frac{pT_1}{pT_1+(1-p)T_2}$ and

$$q\frac{y_1}{T_1} + (1-q)\frac{y_2}{T_2} = \frac{py_1 + (1-p)y_2}{pT_1 + (1-p)T_2},$$
$$q\frac{\mathbf{z}_1}{T_1} + (1-q)\frac{\mathbf{z}_2}{T_2} = \frac{p\mathbf{z}_1 + (1-p)\mathbf{z}_2}{pT_1 + (1-p)T_2}.$$

Since $\mathcal{S}^n$ is convex,

$$(py_1 + (1-p)y_2,\ p\mathbf{z}_1 + (1-p)\mathbf{z}_2,\ pT_1 + (1-p)T_2) \in \mathcal{S}^n.$$

Thus, by definition of $\mathcal{P}^n$ again, (6) holds and the proved is finished. □

4.2. Key-feature inequality and supermatingale construction

First of all, we have the following fundamental performance lemma which states that the optimality of (1)-(2) is achievable within the closure of the set $\mathcal{P}^n$ specified in Definition 2.2.

Lemma 4.2. *Let f_* be the optimal objective of (1)-(2). Then, for each $n \in \{1, 2, \cdots, N\}$, there exists a pair $\left(\overline{f}_*^n,\ \overline{\mathbf{g}}_*^n\right) \in \overline{\mathcal{P}^n}$, the closure of $\mathcal{P}^n$ such that the following hold:*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{N} \overline{f}_*^n = f_*$$
$$\sum_{n=1}^{N} \overline{g}_{l,*}^n \leq d_l,\ l \in \{1, 2, \cdots, L\},$$

i.e. the optimality is achievable within $\otimes_{n=1}^N \overline{\mathcal{P}^n}$, the Cartesian product of $\overline{\mathcal{P}^n}$.

Furthermore, for any $\left(\overline{f}^n,\ \overline{\mathbf{g}}^n\right) \in \overline{\mathcal{P}^n},\ n \in \{1, 2, \cdots, N\}$, satisfying $\sum_{n=1}^N \overline{g}_l^n \leq d_l,\ l \in \{1, 2, \cdots, L\}$, we have $\sum_{n=1}^N \overline{f}^n \geq f_*$, i.e. one cannot achieve better performance than (1)-(2) in $\otimes_{n=1}^N \overline{\mathcal{P}^n}$.

The proof of this Lemma is delayed to Appendix A.

Remark 4.1. *Note that directly computing $\overline{f}^n_*$ and $\overline{g}^n_{l,*}$ indicated by Lemma 4.2 would be difficult because of the fractional nature of $\overline{\mathcal{P}^n}$, the coupling between different systems through time average constraints and the fact that $d_l = \mathbb{E}(d_l[t])$ is unknown. However, Lemma 4.2 can be used to prove important performance theorems regarding our proposed algorithm as is indicated by the following lemma.*

The following key-feature inequality connects our proposed algorithm with the performance vectors inside $\overline{\mathcal{P}^n}$.

Lemma 4.3. *Consider the stochastic processes $\{y^n[t]\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$, $\{\mathbf{z}^n[t]\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$, and $\{T_k^n\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ resulting from the proposed algorithm. For any system n, the following holds for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and any $(\overline{f}^n, \overline{\mathbf{g}}^n) \in \overline{\mathcal{P}^n}$,*

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}\Big(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n}\left(Vy^n[t] + \langle \mathbf{Q}[t_k^n], \mathbf{z}^n[t]\rangle\right)\Big|\, \mathbf{Q}[t_k^n]\Big)}{\mathbb{E}\big(T_k^n|\mathbf{Q}[t_k^n]\big)} \leq V\overline{f}^n + \langle \mathbf{Q}[t_k^n], \overline{\mathbf{g}}^n\rangle\,, \tag{7}$$

Proof. First of all, since the proposed algorithm solves (5) over all possible decisions in $\mathcal{A}^n$, it must achieve value less than or equal to that of any action $\alpha^n \in \mathcal{A}^n$ at the same frame. This gives,

$$D_k^n \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}\Big(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n}\left(Vy^n[t] + \langle \mathbf{Q}[t_k^n], \mathbf{z}^n[t]\rangle\right)\Big|\, \mathbf{Q}[t_k^n], \alpha_k^n = \alpha^n\Big)}{\mathbb{E}\big(T_k^n\big|\, \mathbf{Q}[t_k^n], \alpha_k^n = \alpha^n\big)} = \frac{V\widehat{y}^n(\alpha^n) + \langle \mathbf{Q}[t_k^n], \widehat{\mathbf{z}}^n(\alpha^n)\rangle}{\widehat{T}^n(\alpha^n)},$$

where the equality follows from the renewal property of the system that given $\alpha_k^n = \alpha^n$, T_k^n, $\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n} y^n[t]$ and $\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n} \mathbf{z}^n[t]$ are independent of $\mathbf{Q}[t_k^n]$.

Since $T_k^n \geq 1$, this implies

$$\widehat{T}^n(\alpha^n)\cdot D_k^n \leq V\widehat{y}^n(\alpha^n) + \langle \mathbf{Q}[t_k^n], \widehat{\mathbf{z}}^n(\alpha^n)\rangle\,,$$

thus, for any $\alpha^n \in \mathcal{A}^n$,

$$V\widehat{y}^n(\alpha^n) + \langle \mathbf{Q}[t_k^n], \widehat{\mathbf{z}}^n(\alpha^n)\rangle - D_k^n\cdot\widehat{T}^n(\alpha^n) \geq 0.$$

Since $\mathcal{S}^n$ specified in Definition 2.2 is the convex hull of $\Big\{(\widehat{y}^n(\alpha^n),\ \widehat{\mathbf{z}}^n(\alpha^n),\ \widehat{T}^n(\alpha^n)),\ \alpha^n \in \mathcal{A}^n\Big\}$, it follows for any vector $(y, \mathbf{z}, T) \in \mathcal{S}^n$, we have

$$Vy + \langle \mathbf{Q}[t_k^n], \mathbf{z}\rangle - D_k^n\cdot T \geq 0.$$

Dividing both sides by T and use the definition of $\mathcal{P}^n$ in Definition 2.2 give

$$D_k^n \leq V\overline{f}^n + \langle \mathbf{Q}[t_k^n], \overline{\mathbf{g}}^n\rangle\,,\ \forall(\overline{f}^n, \overline{\mathbf{g}}^n) \in \mathcal{P}^n.$$

Finally, since $\{y^n[t]\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$, $\{\mathbf{z}^n[t]\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$, and $\{T_k^n\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ result from the proposed algorithm and the action chosen is determined by $\mathbf{Q}[t_k^n]$ as in (5),

$$D_k^n = \frac{\mathbb{E}\Big(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n}\left(Vy^n[t] + \langle \mathbf{Q}[t_k^n], \mathbf{z}^n[t]\rangle\right)\Big|\, \mathbf{Q}[t_k^n]\Big)}{\mathbb{E}\big(T_k^n|\mathbf{Q}[t_k^n]\big)}.$$

This finishes the proof. □

With Lemma 4.3, we can construct a supermatingale as follows,

Lemma 4.4. *Consider the stochastic processes* $\{y^n[t]\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$, $\{\mathbf{z}^n[t]\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$, *and* $\{T_k^n\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ *result from the proposed algorithm. For any* $(\overline{f}^n, \overline{\mathbf{g}}^n) \in \overline{\mathcal{P}^n}$, *let*

$$X^n[t] := V\left(y^n[t] - \overline{f}^n\right) + \langle \mathbf{Q}[t], \mathbf{z}^n[t] - \overline{\mathbf{g}}^n \rangle, \tag{8}$$

then,

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n} X^n[t] \middle| \mathcal{F}[t_k^n]\right) \leq Lz_{\max}(Nz_{\max} + d_{\max})B := C_0,$$

where B, $z_{\max}$ *and* $d_{\max}$ *are as defined in Assumption 2.2. Furthermore, define a process* $Y[K]$ *such that* $Y[0] = 0$ *and*

$$Y[K] = \sum_{k=0}^{K-1}\left(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n} X^n[t] - C_0\right), \ K \geq 1.$$

Then, $\{Y[K]\}_{K=0}^{\infty}$ *is a supermartingale adapted to the filtration* $\{\mathcal{F}[t_K^n]\}_{K=0}^{\infty}$.

Proof. In Appendix B, we show that $\{\mathcal{F}[t_K^n]\}_{K=0}^{\infty}$ is indeed a valid filtration. Consider any $t \in \mathcal{T}_k^n$, then, we can decompose $X^n[t]$ as follows

$$X^n[t] = V(y^n[t] - \overline{f}^n) + \langle \mathbf{Q}[t_k^n], \mathbf{z}^n[t] - \overline{\mathbf{g}}^n \rangle + \langle \mathbf{Q}[t] - \mathbf{Q}[t_k^n], \mathbf{z}^n[t] - \overline{\mathbf{g}}^n \rangle. \tag{9}$$

By the queue updating rule (4), we have for any $l \in \{1, 2, \cdots, L\}$ and any $t > t_k^n$,

$$|Q_l[t] - Q_l[t_k^n]| \leq \sum_{s=t_k^n}^{t-1}\left|\sum_{m=1}^{N} z_l^m[s] - d_l[t]\right| \leq (t - t_k^n)(Nz_{\max} + d_{\max}) \tag{10}$$

Thus, for the last term in (9), by Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \mathbf{Q}[t] - \mathbf{Q}[t_k^n], \mathbf{z}^n[t] - \overline{\mathbf{g}}^n \rangle \leq & \|\mathbf{Q}[t] - \mathbf{Q}[t_k^n]\|_1 \cdot \|\mathbf{z}^n[t] - \overline{\mathbf{g}}^n\|_\infty \\
\leq & \sum_{s=t_k^n}^{t-1}\left\|\sum_{m=1}^{N}\mathbf{z}^n[s] - \mathbf{d}[t]\right\|_1 \cdot \|\mathbf{z}^n[t] - \overline{\mathbf{g}}^n\|_\infty \\
\leq & (t - t_k^n)L(Nz_{\max} + d_{\max}) \cdot 2z_{\max},
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from (10) and the last inequality follows from the boundedness assumption (Assumption 2.2) of corresponding quantities. Thus, substituting this bound into (9) gives a bound on $\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n} X^n[t] \middle| \mathcal{F}[t_k^n]\right)$ as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n} X^n[t] \middle| \mathcal{F}[t_k^n]\right) \leq & \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n}\left(V\left(y^n[t] - \overline{f}^n\right) + \langle \mathcal{F}[t_k^n], \mathbf{z}^n[t] - \overline{\mathbf{g}}^n\rangle\right) \middle| \mathcal{F}[t_k^n]\right) \\
& + \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n}(t - t_k^n) \middle| \mathcal{F}[t_k^n]\right) \cdot 2L(Nz_{\max} + d_{\max})z_{\max} \\
\leq & \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n}\left(V\left(y^n[t] - \overline{f}^n\right) + \langle \mathbf{Q}[t_k^n], \mathbf{z}^n[t] - \overline{\mathbf{g}}^n\rangle\right) \middle| \mathcal{F}[t_k^n]\right) \\
& + \mathbb{E}\left((T_k^n)^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}[t_k^n]\right) \cdot L(Nz_{\max} + d_{\max})z_{\max},
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where we use the definition $T_k^n = t_{k+1}^n - t_k^n$ in last equality. Note that for the proposed algorithm, each system makes decisions purely based on the virtual queue state $\mathbf{Q}[t_k^n]$. Also, by the renewal property of each system, given the action at the k-th renewal, the random quantities T_k^n, $\mathbf{z}^n[t]$ and $y^n[t]$, $t \in \mathcal{T}_k^n$ are independent of the outcomes from the slots before t_k^n. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n}\left(V\left(y^n[t]-\overline{f}^n\right)+\langle\mathbf{Q}[t_k^n],\mathbf{z}^n[t]-\overline{\mathbf{g}}^n\rangle\right)\middle|\mathcal{F}[t_k^n]\right)\\&=\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n}\left(V\left(y^n[t]-\overline{f}^n\right)+\langle\mathbf{Q}[t_k^n],\mathbf{z}^n[t]-\overline{\mathbf{g}}^n\rangle\right)\middle|\mathbf{Q}[t_k^n]\right)\end{aligned}\tag{12}$$

By Lemma 4.3, we have the following:

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n}\left(Vy^n[t]+\langle\mathbf{Q}[t_k^n],\mathbf{z}^n[t]\rangle\right)\middle|\mathbf{Q}[t_k^n]\right)\leq\left(V\overline{f}^n+\langle\mathbf{Q}[t_k^n],\overline{\mathbf{g}}^n\rangle\right)\cdot\mathbb{E}(T_k^n|\mathbf{Q}[t_k^n]).$$

Thus, rearranging terms in above inequality gives the expectation on the right hand side of (12) is no greater than 0 and hence the first expectation on the right hand side of (11) is also no greater than 0. For the second expectation in (11), using (3) in Assumption 2.2 gives $\mathbb{E}\big((T_k^n)^2\big|\,\mathcal{F}[t_k^n]\big)\leq B$ and the first part of the lemma is proved.

For the second part of the lemma, it is obvious that $Y[K]\in\mathcal{F}[t_K^n],\ \forall K\in\mathbb{Z}^+$ and

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\left|\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n}X^n[t]\right|\right)\leq\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n}|X^n[t]|\right)<\infty,\ \forall k.$$

Thus, $\mathbb{E}(|Y[K]|)<\infty,\ \forall K\in\mathbb{Z}^+$, i.e. it is absolutely integrable. Furthermore, by the first part of the lemma,

$$\mathbb{E}(Y[K+1]\mid\mathcal{F}[t_K^n])=Y[K]+\mathbb{E}\left(\left(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_K^n}X^n[t]-C_0\right)\ \middle|\ \mathcal{F}[t_K^n]\right)\leq Y[K],$$

finishing the proof. □

4.3. Synchronization lemma

So far, we have analyzed the processes related to each individual system over its renewal frames. However, due the asynchronous behavior of different systems, the supermartingales of each system cannot be immediately summed.

In order to get a global performance bound, we have to get rid of any index related to individual renewal frames only. In other words, we need to look at the system property at any time slot T as opposed to any renewal t_k^n.

Lemma 4.5. *For any fixed $T\in\mathbb{Z}^+$, we have*

$$\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\mathbb{E}(X^n[t])\leq C_1+\frac{C_2V}{T},$$

where

$$C_1:=6Lz_{\max}(Nz_{\max}+d_{\max})B,\quad C_2:=2y_{\max}\sqrt{B}.$$

Proof. Recall our renewals for each system are indexed as $k = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$. We start by defining τ as the first renewal after time T. In Appendix B, we show that τ is a valid stopping time on the grid $k = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$, with respect to the filtration $\{\mathcal{F}[t_k^n]\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$. Furthermore, by Theorem B.1, and the fact that $\{Y[K]\}_{K=0}^{\infty}$ is a supermartingale, we have the stopping time process $\{Y[K\wedge\tau]\}_{K=0}^{\infty}$ is also a supermartingale, where $a \wedge b := \min\{a, b\}$.

Now, for any fixed $T \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, consider

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} X^n[t]\right) =& \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t=0}^{t_\tau^n-1} X^n[t] - \sum_{t=T}^{t_\tau^n-1} X^n[t]\right)\\
=& \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t=1}^{t_\tau^n-1} X^n[t]\right) - \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t=T}^{t_\tau^n-1} X^n[t]\right)\\
=& \mathbb{E}(Y[\tau]) + C_0\mathbb{E}(\tau) - \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t=T}^{t_\tau^n-1} X^n[t]\right)\\
\leq& \mathbb{E}(Y[\tau]) + C_0(T+1) - \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t=T}^{t_\tau^n-1} X^n[t]\right), \qquad (13)
\end{aligned}$$

where the third equality follows from the definition of $Y[K]$ in Lemma 4.4 and the last inequality follows from the fact that $\tau \leq T+1$. For the term $\mathbb{E}(Y[\tau])$, we use the fact that $\{Y[K\wedge\tau]\}_{K=0}^{\infty}$ is a supermartingale and get

$$\mathbb{E}(Y[K\wedge\tau]) \leq 0, \ \forall K \in \mathbb{Z}^+.$$

Since $\tau \leq T+1$, it follows

$$\mathbb{E}(Y[\tau]) = \mathbb{E}(Y[(T+1)\wedge\tau]) \leq \mathbb{E}(Y[0]) = 0.$$

For the last term in (13), by queue updating rule (4), for any $l \in \{1, 2, \cdots, L\}$,

$$|Q_l[t]| \leq \sum_{s=0}^{t-1}\left|\sum_{m=1}^{N} z_l^m[s] - d_l[t]\right| \leq t(Nz_{\max} + d_{\max}),$$

it then follows from Hölder's inequality again that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left(\left|\sum_{t=T}^{t_\tau^n-1} X^n[t]\right|\right) =& \mathbb{E}\left(\left|\sum_{t=T}^{t_\tau^n-1}\left(V(y^n[t] - \overline{f}_*^n) + \langle \mathbf{Q}[t], \mathbf{z}^n[t] - \overline{\mathbf{g}}_*^n\rangle\right)\right|\right)\\
\leq& \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t=T}^{t_\tau^n-1}\left(V\left|y^n[t] - \overline{f}_*^n\right| + \|\mathbf{Q}[t]\|_1 \cdot \|\mathbf{z}^n[t] - \overline{\mathbf{g}}_*^n\|_\infty\right)\right)\\
\leq& \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t=T}^{t_\tau^n-1}\left(2Vy_{\max} + L(Nz_{\max} + d_{\max})t \cdot 2z_{\max}\right)\right)\\
=& 2Vy_{\max} \cdot \mathbb{E}(t_\tau^n - T) + Lz_{\max}(Nz_{\max} + d_{\max})\left((2T-1)\cdot\mathbb{E}(t_\tau^n - T) + \mathbb{E}(t_\tau^n - T)^2\right)\\
\leq& 2Vy_{\max}\sqrt{B} + 2Lz_{\max}(Nz_{\max} + d_{\max})\sqrt{B}T + Lz_{\max}(Nz_{\max} + d_{\max})B\\
\leq& 2Vy_{\max}\sqrt{B} + 2Lz_{\max}(Nz_{\max} + d_{\max})B(T+1),
\end{aligned}$$

where in the second from last inequality we use (3) of Assumption 2.2 that the residual life $t_\tau^n - T$ satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}\big((t_\tau^n - T)^2\big) = \mathbb{E}\big(\mathbb{E}\big((t_\tau^n - T)^2 \big|\ t_\tau^n - t_{\tau-1}^n \geq T - t_{\tau-1}^n\big)\big) \leq B$$

and $\mathbb{E}(t_\tau^n - T) \leq \sqrt{B}$, and in the last inequality we use the fact that $B \geq 1$, thus, $\sqrt{B} \leq B$. Substitute the above bound into (13) gives

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} X^n[t]\right) \leq& C_0(T+1) + 2Vy_{\max}B + 2Lz_{\max}(Nz_{\max} + d_{\max})B(T+1)\\ =& 2Vy_{\max}\sqrt{B} + 3Lz_{\max}(Nz_{\max} + d_{\max})B(T+1)\\ \leq& 2Vy_{\max}\sqrt{B} + 6Lz_{\max}(z_{\max} + d_{\max})BT\end{aligned}$$

where we use the definition $C_0 = Lz_{\max}(z_{\max} + d_{\max})B$ from Lemma 4.4 in the equality and use $T + 1 \leq 2T$ in the final equality. Dividing both sides by T finishes the proof. □

4.4. Achieving near optimality

The following lemma connects the virtual queue stability with the constraint violation.

Lemma 4.6. *If* $Q_l[0] = 0$ *and* $\lim_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T}\mathbb{E}(Q_l[T]) = 0$, *then,* $\limsup_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(z_l^n[t]) \leq d_l$.

Proof. For any fixed T, $Q_l[T] = \sum_{t=0}^{T-1}(Q_l[t+1] - Q_l[t])$. For each summand, by queue updating rule (4),

$$\begin{aligned}Q_l[t+1] - Q_l[t] =& \max\left\{Q_l[t] + \sum_{n=1}^{N} z_l^n[t] - d_l[t],\ 0\right\} - Q_l[t]\\ \geq& Q_l[t] + \sum_{n=1}^{N} z_l^n[t] - d_l[t] - Q_l[t] = \sum_{n=1}^{N} z_l^n[t] - d_l[t].\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by the assumption $Q_l[0] = 0$,

$$Q_l[T] \geq \sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\left(\sum_{n=1}^{N} z_l^n[t] - d_l[t]\right).$$

Taking expectation from both sides with $\mathbb{E}(d_l[t]) = d_l,\ \forall l$, gives

$$\mathbb{E}(Q_l[T]) \geq \sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\left(\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(z_l^n[t]) - d_l\right).$$

Dividing both sides by T and passing to the limit gives

$$\limsup_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\left(\sum_{n=1}^{N} z_l^n[t] - d_l\right) \leq \lim_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T}\mathbb{E}(Q_l[T]) = 0,$$

finishing the proof. □

Theorem 4.1. *The proposed algorithm satisfies all the constraints in (2) and achieves $\mathcal{O}(1/V)$ near optimality, i.e.*

$$\limsup_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(y^n[t])\leq f_*+\frac{NC_1+C_3}{V},$$

where f_* is the optimal objective of (1)-(2), C_1 is defined in Lemma 4.5 and $C_3:=(Nz_{\max}+d_{\max})^2L/2$.

Proof. Define the drift-plus-penalty expression at time t as

$$P[t]:=\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{n=1}^{N}Vy^n[t]+\frac{1}{2}\left(\|\mathbf{Q}[t+1]\|^2-\|\mathbf{Q}[t]\|^2\right)\right). \tag{14}$$

By the queue updating rule (4), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
P[t]\leq&\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{n=1}^{N}Vy^n[t]+\frac{1}{2}\sum_{l=1}^{L}\left(\sum_{n=1}^{N}z_l^n[t]-d_l[t]\right)^2+\sum_{l=1}^{L}Q_l[t]\left(\sum_{n=1}^{N}z_l^n[t]-d_l[t]\right)\right)\\
\leq&\frac{1}{2}(Nz_{\max}+d_{\max})^2L+\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{n=1}^{N}Vy^n[t]+\sum_{l=1}^{L}Q_l[t]\left(\sum_{n=1}^{N}z_l^n[t]-d_l[t]\right)\right)\\
=&\frac{1}{2}(Nz_{\max}+d_{\max})^2L+\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{n=1}^{N}Vy^n[t]+\sum_{l=1}^{L}Q_l[t]\left(\sum_{n=1}^{N}z_l^n[t]-d_l\right)\right)
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from the boundedness assumption (Assumption 2.2) that $\sum_{l=1}^{L}\left(\sum_{n=1}^{N}z_l^n[t]-d_l[t]\right)^2\leq(Nz_{\max}+d_{\max})^2L$, and the equality follows from the fact that $d_l[t]$ is i.i.d. and independent of $Q_l[t]$, thus,

$$\mathbb{E}(Q_l[t]d_l[t])=\mathbb{E}(Q_l[t]\cdot\mathbb{E}(d_l[t]|Q_l[t]))=\mathbb{E}(Q_l[t]d_l).$$

For simplicity, define $C_3=\frac{1}{2}(Nz_{\max}+d_{\max})^2L$. Now, by the achievability of optimality in $\otimes_{n=1}^{N}\overline{\mathcal{P}^n}$ (Lemma 4.2), we have $\sum_{n=1}^{N}\overline{g}_{l,*}^n\leq d_l$, thus, substituting this inequality into the above bound for $P[t]$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}
P[t]\leq&C_3+\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{n=1}^{N}Vy^n[t]+\sum_{n=1}^{N}\sum_{l=1}^{L}Q_l[t]\left(z_l^n[t]-\overline{g}_{l,*}^n\right)\right)\\
=&C_3+\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(Vy^n[t]+\langle\mathbf{Q}[t],\mathbf{z}^n[t]-\overline{\mathbf{g}}_*^n\rangle)\\
=&C_3+\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(X^n[t])+V\sum_{n=1}^{N}\overline{f}_*^n\\
=&C_3+\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(X^n[t])+Vf_*,
\end{aligned}$$

where we use the definition of $X^n[t]$ in (8) by substituting $(\overline{f}^n,\overline{\mathbf{g}}^n)$ with $(\overline{f}_*^n,\overline{\mathbf{g}}_*^n)$, i.e. $X^n[t]=V(y^n[t]-\overline{f}_*^n)+\langle\mathbf{Q}[t],\mathbf{z}^n[t]-\overline{\mathbf{g}}_*^n\rangle$, in the second from last equality and use the optimality condition

(Lemma 4.2) in the final equality. Now, by Lemma 4.5, we have for any $T \in \mathbb{Z}^+$,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} P[t] \leq & C_3 + Vf_* + \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(X^n[t]) \\ = & C_3 + Vf_* + \sum_{n=1}^{N}\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\mathbb{E}(X^n[t]) \\ \leq & NC_1 + C_3 + Vf_* + \frac{NC_2V}{T}. \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

On the other hand, by the definition of $P[t]$ in (14) and then telescoping sums with $\mathbf{Q}[0] = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} P[t] = & \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{n=1}^{N} Vy^n[t] + \frac{1}{2}\left(\|\mathbf{Q}[t+1]\|^2 - \|\mathbf{Q}[t]\|^2\right)\right) \\ = & \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\sum_{n=1}^{N} V\mathbb{E}(y^n[t]) + \frac{1}{2T}\mathbb{E}\big(\|\mathbf{Q}[T]\|^2\big). \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with inequality (15) gives

$$\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\sum_{n=1}^{N} V\mathbb{E}(y^n[t]) + \frac{1}{2T}\mathbb{E}\big(\|\mathbf{Q}[T]\|^2\big) \leq NC_1 + C_3 + Vf_* + \frac{NC_2V}{T}. \tag{16}$$

Since $\frac{1}{2T}\mathbb{E}\big(\|\mathbf{Q}[T]\|_2^2\big) \geq 0$, we can throw away the term and the inequality still holds, i.e.

$$\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(y^n[t]) \leq f_* + \frac{NC_1 + C_3}{V} + \frac{NC_2}{T}. \tag{17}$$

Taking $\limsup_{T\to\infty}$ from both sides gives the near optimality in the theorem.

To get the constraint violation bound, we use Assumption 2.2 that $|y^n[t]| \leq y_{\max}$, then, by (16) again, we have

$$\frac{1}{T}\mathbb{E}\big(\|\mathbf{Q}[T]\|^2\big) \leq 2(NC_1 + C_3) + 4Vy_{\max} + \frac{NC_2V}{T}.$$

By Jensen's inequality $\mathbb{E}\big(\|\mathbf{Q}[T]\|^2\big) \geq \mathbb{E}(\|\mathbf{Q}[T]\|)^2$. This implies that

$$\mathbb{E}(\|\mathbf{Q}[T]\|) \leq \sqrt{(2(NC_1 + C_3) + 4Vy_{\max})T + NC_2V},$$

which implies

$$\frac{1}{T}\mathbb{E}(\|\mathbf{Q}[T]\|) \leq \sqrt{\frac{2(NC_1 + C_3) + 4Vy_{\max}}{T} + \frac{NC_2V}{T^2}}. \tag{18}$$

Sending $T \to \infty$ gives

$$\lim_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T}\mathbb{E}(Q_l[T]) = 0, \quad \forall l \in \{1, 2, \cdots, L\}.$$

Finally, by Lemma 4.6, all constraints are satisfies and we finish the proof. □

Note that the above proof implies a more refined result that illustrates the convergence time. Fix an $\varepsilon > 0$, let $V = 1/\varepsilon$, then, for all $T \geq 1/\varepsilon$, (17) implies that

$$\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(y^n[t]) \leq f_* + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon).$$

However, (18) suggests a larger convergence time is required for constraint satisfaction! For $V = 1/\varepsilon$, it can be shown that (18) implies that

$$\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(z_l^n[t]) \leq d_l + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon),$$

whenever $T \geq 1/\varepsilon^3$. The next section shows a tighter $1/\varepsilon^2$ convergence time with a mild Lagrange multiplier assumption.

5. Convergence Time Analysis

5.1. Lagrange Multipliers

Consider the following optimization problem:

$$\min \quad \sum_{n=1}^{N}\overline{f}^n \tag{19}$$

$$s.t. \quad \sum_{n=1}^{N}\overline{g}_l^n \leq d_l, \ \forall l \in \{1,2,\cdots,L\}, \tag{20}$$

$$(\overline{f}^n, \overline{\mathbf{g}}^n) \in \overline{\mathcal{P}^n}, \ \forall n \in \{1,2,\cdots,N\}. \tag{21}$$

Since $\mathcal{P}^n$ is convex, it follows $\overline{\mathcal{P}^n}$ is convex and $\otimes_{n=1}^{N}\overline{\mathcal{P}^n}$ is also convex. Thus, (19)-(21) is a convex program. Furthermore, by Lemma 4.2, one has (19)-(21) is feasible if and only if (1)-(2) is feasible, and when assuming feasibility, they have the same optimality f_* as is specified in Lemma 4.2.

To get the convergence time result, we need the following non-vertical separating hyperplane assumption:

Assumption 5.1. *There exists non-negative finite constants $\gamma_1, \ \gamma_2, \ \cdots, \ \gamma_L$ such that the following holds,*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{N}\overline{f}^n + \sum_{l=1}^{L}\gamma_l\sum_{n=1}^{N}\overline{g}_l^n \geq f_* + \sum_{l=1}^{L}\gamma_l d_l, \ \forall(\overline{f}^n, \overline{\mathbf{g}}^n) \in \overline{\mathcal{P}^n},$$

i.e. there exists a hyperplane parametrized by $(1,\gamma_1,\cdots,\gamma_L)$ passing through $(f_*,d_1,\cdots,d_L)$ and contains the set $\left\{\left(\sum_{n=1}^{N}\overline{f}^n, \ \sum_{n=1}^{N}\overline{\mathbf{g}}^n\right) : \ (\overline{f}^n,\overline{\mathbf{g}}^n) \in \overline{\mathcal{P}^n}, \ \forall n \in \{1,2,\cdots,N\}.\right\}$ on one side.

Remark 5.1. *The parameters $\gamma_1, \ \cdots, \ \gamma_L$ are called Lagrange multipliers. Since (19)-(21) is a convex program, by Farkas' Lemma (Proposition 5.1.1. of [2]), $\gamma_1, \ \gamma_2, \ \cdots, \ \gamma_L$ exists if the Slater's condition[1] holds. It also holds under other more general situations (see [2] for more details).*

[1]Slater's condition says there exists nonempty interior of the feasible region for the convex program.

Lemma 5.1. *Suppose* $\{y^n[t]\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$, $\{\mathbf{z}^n[t]\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$ *and* $\{T_k^n\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ *are processes result from the proposed algorithm. Under the Assumption 5.1,*

$$\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\left(f_* - \sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(y^n[t])\right) \leq \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\sum_{l=1}^{L}\gamma_l\left(\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(z_l^n[t]) - d_l\right) + \frac{C_4}{T},$$

where $C_4 = B_1N + B_2N\sum_{l=1}^{L}\gamma_l$, *and* B_1, B_2 *are defined in Lemma A.1.*

Proof. First of all, from the statement of Lemma A.1, for the proposed algorithm, we can define the corresponding processes $(f^n[t], \mathbf{g}^n[t])$ for all n as

$$\begin{aligned} f^n[t] =& \widehat{f}^n(\alpha^n) = \widehat{y}^n(\alpha^n)/\widehat{T}^n(\alpha^n), \quad \text{if } t \in \mathcal{T}_k^n, \alpha_k^n = \alpha^n \\ \mathbf{g}^n[t] =& \widehat{\mathbf{g}}^n(\alpha^n) = \widehat{\mathbf{z}}^n(\alpha^n)/\widehat{T}^n(\alpha^n), \quad \text{if } t \in \mathcal{T}_k^n, \alpha_k^n = \alpha^n, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the definition of $\widehat{f}^n(\alpha^n)$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{g}}^n(\alpha^n)$ in Definition 2.1. Since $\left(\widehat{y}^n(\alpha^n),\ \widehat{\mathbf{z}}^n(\alpha^n),\ \widehat{T}^n(\alpha^n)\right) \in \mathcal{S}^n$, by definition of $\mathcal{P}^n$ in Definition 2.2, $(f^n[t], \mathbf{g}^n[t]) \in \mathcal{P}^n \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{P}^n}$, $\forall n$, $\forall t$. Since $\overline{\mathcal{P}^n}$ is a convex set by Lemma 4.1, it follows

$$(\mathbb{E}(f^n[t]),\ \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{g}^n[t])) \in \overline{\mathcal{P}^n}, \quad \forall t,\ \forall n.$$

By Assumption 5.1, we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(f^n[t]) + \sum_{l=1}^{L}\gamma_l\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(g_l^n[t]) \geq f_* + \sum_{l=1}^{L}\gamma_l d_l, \quad \forall t.$$

Rearranging terms gives

$$f_* - \sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(f^n[t]) \leq \sum_{l=1}^{L}\gamma_l\left(\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(g_l^n[t]) - d_l\right), \quad \forall t.$$

Taking the time average from 0 to $T-1$ gives

$$\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\left(f_* - \sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(f^n[t])\right) \leq \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\sum_{l=1}^{L}\gamma_l\left(\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(g_l^n[t]) - d_l\right). \tag{22}$$

For the left hand side of (22), we have

$$\begin{aligned} l.h.s. =& \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\left(f_* - \sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(y^n[t])\right) + \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(y^n[t] - f^n[t]) \\ \geq& \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\left(f_* - \sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(y^n[t])\right) - \frac{B_1N}{T}. \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

where the inequality follows from (32) in Lemma A.1. For the right hand side of (22), we have

$$\begin{aligned} r.h.s. =& \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\sum_{l=1}^{L}\gamma_l\left(\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(z_l^n[t]) - d_l\right) + \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\sum_{l=1}^{L}\gamma_l\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(g_l^n[t] - z_l^n[t]) \\ \leq& \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\sum_{l=1}^{L}\gamma_l\left(\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(z_l^n[t]) - d_l\right) + \frac{B_2N\sum_{l=1}^{L}\gamma_l}{T}, \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

where the inequality follows from the fact that $\gamma_l \geq 0$, $\forall l$ and (33) in Lemma A.1. Substituting (23) and (24) into (22) finishes the proof. □

5.2. Convergence time theorem

Theorem 5.1. *Fix $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ and define $V = 1/\varepsilon$. If the problem (1)-(2) is feasible and the Assumption 5.1 holds, then, for all $T \geq 1/\varepsilon^2$,*

$$\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(y^n[t]) \leq f_* + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon), \tag{25}$$

$$\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(z_l^n[t]) \leq d_l + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon), l \in \{1,2,\cdots,L\}. \tag{26}$$

Thus, the algorithm provides $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ approximation with the convergence time $\mathcal{O}(1/\varepsilon^2)$.

Proof. First of all, by queue updating rule (4),

$$\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\left(\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(z_l^n[t]) - d_l\right) \leq \mathbb{E}(Q_l[T]). \tag{27}$$

By Lemma 5.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\left(f_* - \sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(y^n[t])\right) \leq& \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\sum_{l=1}^{L}\gamma_l\left(\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(z_l^n[t]) - d_l\right) + \frac{C_4}{T},\\ \leq& \sum_{l=1}^{L}\frac{\gamma_l}{T}\mathbb{E}(Q_l[T]) + \frac{C_4}{T}.\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

Combining this with (16) gives

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2T}\mathbb{E}\big(\|\mathbf{Q}[T]\|^2\big) &\leq NC_1 + C_3 + \frac{V}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\left(f_* - \sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(y^n[t])\right) + \frac{NC_2V}{T}\\ &\leq NC_1 + C_3 + \frac{(NC_2+C_4)V}{T} + V\sum_{l=1}^{L}\frac{\gamma_l}{T}\mathbb{E}(Q_l[T])\\ &\leq NC_1 + C_3 + \frac{(NC_2+C_4)V}{T} + \frac{V}{T}\|\gamma\|\cdot\|\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{Q}[T])\|,\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

where $\gamma := (\gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_L)$, the second inequality follows from (28) and the final inequality follows from Cauchy-Schwarz. Then, by Jensen's inequality, we have

$$\|\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{Q}[T])\|^2 \leq \mathbb{E}\big(\|\mathbf{Q}[T]\|^2\big).$$

Thus, it follows by (29) that

$$\|\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{Q}[T])\|^2 - 2V\|\gamma\|\cdot\|\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{Q}[T])\| - 2(NC_1+C_3)T - 2(NC_2+C_4)V \leq 0.$$

The left hand side is a quadratic form on $\|\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{Q}[T])\|$, and the inequality implies that $\|\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{Q}[T])\|$ is deterministically upper bounded by the largest root of the equation $x^2 - bx - c = 0$ with $b = 2V\|\gamma\|$ and $c = 2(NC_1+C_3)T + 2(NC_2+C_4)V$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{Q}[T])\| \leq& \frac{b+\sqrt{b^2+4c}}{2}\\ =& V\|\gamma\| + \sqrt{V^2\|\gamma\|^2 + 2(NC_1+C_3)T + 2(NC_2+C_4)V}\\ \leq& 2V\|\gamma\| + \sqrt{2(NC_1+C_3)T} + \sqrt{2(NC_2+C_4)V}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, for any $l \in \{1, 2, \cdots, L\}$,

$$\frac{1}{T}\mathbb{E}(Q_l[T]) \leq \frac{2V\|\gamma\|}{T} + \sqrt{\frac{2(NC_1 + C_3)}{T}} + \frac{\sqrt{2(NC_2 + C_4)V}}{T}.$$

By (27) again,

$$\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(z_l^n[t]) \leq d_l + \frac{2V\|\gamma\|}{T} + \sqrt{\frac{2(NC_1 + C_3)}{T}} + \frac{\sqrt{2(NC_2 + C_4)V}}{T}.$$

Substituting $V = 1/\varepsilon$ and $T \geq 1/\varepsilon^2$ into the above inequality gives $\forall l \in \{1, 2, \cdots, L\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(z_l^n[t]) \leq & d_l + \left(2\|\gamma\| + \sqrt{2(NC_1 + C_3)}\right)\varepsilon + \sqrt{2(NC_2 + C4)}\varepsilon^{3/2} \\ = & d_l + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon).\end{aligned}$$

Finally, substituting $V = 1/\varepsilon$ and $T \geq 1/\varepsilon^2$ into (17) gives

$$\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(y^n[t]) \leq f_* + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon),$$

finishing the proof. □

6. Application in Energy-aware Scheduling

6.1. Model Description

Consider a slotted time system with L classes of jobs and N servers. Jobs of each class arrive according to poisson distribution with rates $\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_L$, respectively. The rates can be unknown to the servers. These jobs are stored in separate queues denoted as $Q_1[t], \cdots, Q_L[t]$. Assume the system is empty at time $t = 0$ so that $Q_l[0] = 0, \forall l \in \{1, 2, \cdots, L\}$. Let $\lambda_l[t]$ be the precise number of class l job arrivals at slot t, then, we have $\mathbb{E}(\lambda_l[t]) = \lambda_l, \forall l \in \{1, 2, \cdots, L\}$. Let $\mu_l^n[t]$ and $e^n[t]$ be the number of class l jobs served and energy consumption at time slot t, respectively.

Each server makes decisions over renewal frames and the first frame starts at time slot $t = 0$. Successive renewals can happen at different slots for different servers. For the n-th server, at the beginning of k-th frame ($k \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{0\}$), it chooses a processing mode m_k^n within the set of all modes $\mathcal{M}^n$. The processing mode m_k^n gives the following quantities within the frame:

- The uniformly distributed total number of class l jobs that can be served with expectation $\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n}\mu_l^n[t]\middle|\ m_k^n\right) := \widehat{\mu}_l^n(m_k^n)$.
- The geometrically distributed service duration H_k^n slots with expectation $\mathbb{E}(H_k^n|\ m_k^n) := \widehat{H}^n(m_k^n)$.
- The deterministic energy consumption $\widehat{e}^n(m_k^n)$ for serving all these jobs.
- The geometrically distributed idle/setup time I_k^n slots with constant energy consumption p^n per slot and zero job service. The expectation $\mathbb{E}(I_k^n|\ m_k^n) := \widehat{I}^n(m_k^n)$.

Thus, the expected frame size

$$\widehat{T}^n(m_k^n) = \widehat{H}^n(m_k^n) + \widehat{I}^n(m_k^n),$$

TABLE 1
Problem parameters

	λ_i	$\widehat{H}^n(i)$	$\widehat{\mu}^n(i)$	$\widehat{e}^n(i)$	$\widehat{I}^n(i)$
Class 1	2	5.5	15 (Uniform $[9,21]\cap\mathbb{Z}^+$)	16	2.5
Class 2	3	4.6	21 (Uniform $[15,27]\cap\mathbb{Z}^+$)	20	4.3
Class 3	4	3.8	17 (Uniform $[11,23]\cap\mathbb{Z}^+$)	13	3.7

and we have the expected total energy consumption during k-th frame is given by

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n} e_l^n[t]\middle|\ m_k^n\right) = \widehat{e}_l^n(m_k^n) + p^n\cdot\widehat{I}^n(m_k^n).$$

The goal is to minimize the time average energy consumption, subject to the queue stability constraints, i.e.

$$\min \quad \limsup_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(e^n[t]) \tag{30}$$

$$s.t. \quad \liminf_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(\mu_l^n[t])\geq\lambda_l,\ \forall l\in\{1,2,\cdots,L\}. \tag{31}$$

Previously, [12] treats a special case of this problem where all quantities are deterministic functions of the processing modes. Here, we apply the algorithm introduced in Section 3 to deal with the situation that incorporates randomness. To be specific, the queue updating rule is

$$Q_l[t+1] = \max\left\{Q_l[t]+\lambda_l[t]-\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mu_l^n[t],\ 0\right\},$$

and (5) can be written as

$$\min_{m_k^n\in\mathcal{M}^n}\frac{V\left(\widehat{e}_l^n(m_k^n)+p^n\widehat{I}^n(m_k^n)\right)-\langle\mathbf{Q}[t_k^n],\widehat{\mu}^n(m_k^n)\rangle}{\widehat{H}^n(m_k^n)+\widehat{I}^n(m_k^n)}.$$

Note that from the above queue updating rule, the proposed algorithm does not need the statistics of the arrivals but only the instant realizations. Moreover, the virtual queues become the actual queues in this application.

6.2. Simulation experiments

We consider a scenario with 5 homogeneous servers and 3 different classes of jobs, i.e. $N=5$ and $L=3$. We assume that each server can only choose one class of jobs to serve during each frame. So the mode set $\mathcal{M}^n$ contains three actions $\{1,2,3\}$ and the action i stands for serving the i-th class of jobs and we count the number of services at the end of each service duration. The idle/setup cost is $p^n=3$ units per slot and the rest of the parameters are listed in Table 1.

Each plot for the proposed algorithm is the result of running 1 million slots and taking the time average as the performance of the proposed algorithm. The benchmark is the optimal stationary performance obtained by performing a change of variable and solving a linear program, knowing the arrival rates (see also [12] for details).

Fig. 2 shows as the trade-off parameter V gets larger, the time average energy consumptions under the proposed algorithm approaches the optimal energy consumption. Fig. 3 shows as V gets large, the time average number of services also approaches the optimal service rate for each class of jobs. In Fig. 4, we plot the time average queue backlog for each class of jobs verses V parameter. We see that the queue backlog for the first class is always low whereas the rest queue backlogs scale up linearly with V. This is because the service rate for the first class is always strictly larger than the arrival rate whereas for the rest classes, as V gets larger, the service rates approach the arrival rates. This plot, together with Fig. 2, also demonstrate that V is indeed a trade-off parameter which trades queue backlog for near optimality.



FIG 2. *Time average energy consumption verses V parameter over 1 millon slots.*



FIG 3. *Time average services verses V parameter over 1 millon slots.*



FIG 4. *Time average queue size verses V parameter over 1 million slots.*

Appendix A: Additional lemmas and proofs.

This section is devoted to the proof of Lemma 4.2. The following lemma is a necessary preparation:

Lemma A.1. *Suppose $\{y^n[t]\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$, $\{\mathbf{z}^n[t]\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$ and $\{T_k^n\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ are processes resulting from any algorithm*[2]*, then, $\forall T \in \mathbb{Z}^+$,*

$$\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\mathbb{E}(f^n[t]-y^n[t]) \leq \frac{B_1}{T}, \tag{32}$$

$$\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\mathbb{E}(g_l^n[t]-z_l^n[t]) \leq \frac{B_2}{T},\ l\in\{1,2,\cdots,L\}, \tag{33}$$

where $B_1 = 2y_{\max}\sqrt{B}$, $B_2 = 2z_{\max}\sqrt{B}$ and $f^n[t]$, $\mathbf{g}^n[t]$ are step functions defined as follows

$$f^n[t] = \widehat{f}^n(\alpha^n), \quad \text{if } t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n, \alpha_k^n = \alpha^n$$
$$\mathbf{g}^n[t] = \widehat{\mathbf{g}}^n(\alpha^n), \quad \text{if } t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n, \alpha_k^n = \alpha^n,$$

and $\left(\widehat{f}^n(\alpha^n), \widehat{\mathbf{g}}^n(\alpha^n)\right)$ are defined in Definition 2.1.

Proof. We prove bound (32) ((33) is proved similarly). By definition of $\widehat{f}^n(\alpha^n)$ in Definition 2.1, we have for any $\alpha^n \in \mathcal{A}^n$,

$$\widehat{f}^n(\alpha^n) = \frac{\mathbb{E}\Big(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n} y^n[t]\Big|\ \alpha_k^n = \alpha^n\Big)}{\mathbb{E}\big(T_k^n|\ \alpha_k^n=\alpha^n\big)},$$

thus,

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n}\Big(\widehat{f}^n(\alpha_k^n) - y^n[t]\Big)\right|\ \alpha_k^n = \alpha^n\Bigg) = 0.$$

[2]Note that this algorithm might make decisions using the past information.

By renewal property of the system, given $\alpha_k^n = \alpha^n$, T_k^n and $\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n} y^n[t]$ are independent of the past information before t_k^n. Thus, the same equality holds if conditioning also on $\mathcal{F}[t_k^n]$, i.e.

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n}\left(\widehat{f}^n(\alpha_k^n) - y^n[t]\right)\middle|\ \alpha_k^n = \alpha^n,\ \mathcal{F}[t_k^n]\right) = 0.$$

Hence,

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n}\left(\widehat{f}^n(\alpha_k^n) - y^n[t]\right)\middle|\ \mathcal{F}[t_k^n]\right) = 0.$$

By the definition of $f^n[t]$, this further implies that

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n}\left(f^n[t] - y^n[t]\right)\middle|\ \mathcal{F}[t_k^n]\right) = 0.$$

Since $|y^n[t]| \le y_{\max}$ and $\mathbb{E}(T_k^n) \le \sqrt{B}$, it follows $\mathbb{E}\left(\left|\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n}\left(f^n[t] - y^n[t]\right)\right|\right) < \infty$ and the process $\{F[K]\}_{K=0}^{\infty}$ defined as

$$F[K] = \sum_{k=0}^{K-1}\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n}\left(f^n[t] - y^n[t]\right),\ K\in\mathbb{Z}^+,$$

$F[0] = 0$ is a *martingale*.

Consider any fixed $T \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and define τ as the first renewal after time T. In Appendix B, we show that τ is a valid stopping time on the renewal grid $k = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$, with respect to the filtration $\{\mathcal{F}[t_k^n]\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$. Furthermore, $\{F[K\wedge\tau]\}_{K=0}^{\infty}$ is a supermartingale by Theorem B.1, where $a\wedge b := \min\{a, b\}$.

For this fixed T, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\left(f^n[t] - y^n[t]\right)\right) =& \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t=0}^{t_\tau^n-1}\left(f^n[t] - y^n[t]\right)\right) - \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t=T}^{t_\tau^n-1}\left(f^n[t] - y^n[t]\right)\right)\\ =& \mathbb{E}(F[\tau]) - \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t=T}^{t_\tau^n-1}\left(f^n[t] - y^n[t]\right)\right).\end{aligned}$$

Since $\tau \le T+1$, it follows

$$\mathbb{E}(F[\tau]) = \mathbb{E}(F[(T+1)\wedge\tau]) \le 0.$$

On the other hand,

$$\left|\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t=T}^{t_\tau^n-1}\left(f^n[t] - y^n[t]\right)\right)\right| \le \mathbb{E}(t_\tau^n - T)\cdot 2y_{\max} \le 2y_{\max}\sqrt{B}.$$

where the last inequality follows from Assumption 2.2 for the residual life time. Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\left(f^n[t] - y^n[t]\right)\right) \le 2y_{\max}\sqrt{B}.$$

Dividing both sides by T finishes the proof. □

Proof of Lemma 4.2. To prove the first part of the claim, we define the following notation:

$$\bigoplus_{n=1}^{N}\overline{\mathcal{P}^n}:=\left\{\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbf{p}_n,\ \mathbf{p}_n\in\overline{\mathcal{P}^n},\ \forall n\right\}$$

is the Minkowski sum and for any sequence $\{\mathbf{x}[t]\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$ taking values in $\mathbb{R}^d$, define

$$\limsup_{T\to\infty}\mathbf{x}[T]:=\left(\limsup_{T\to\infty}x_1[T],\ \cdots,\limsup_{T\to\infty}x_d[T]\right)$$

is a vector of lim sup's.

By the feasibility assumption for (1)-(2), we can consider *any algorithm that achieves the optimality* of (1)-(2) and the corresponding process $\{(f^n[t],\mathbf{g}^n[t])\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$ defined in Lemma A.1 for any system n. Notice that $(f^n[t],\mathbf{g}^n[t])\in\overline{\mathcal{P}^n},\ \forall n,\ \forall t$. This follows from the definition of $\widehat{f}^n(\alpha^n)$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{g}}^n(\alpha^n)$ in Definition 2.1 that

$$\begin{aligned}f^n[t]=&\widehat{f}^n(\alpha^n)=\widehat{y}^n(\alpha^n)/\widehat{T}^n(\alpha^n),\quad\text{if } t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n,\alpha_k^n=\alpha^n\\ \mathbf{g}^n[t]=&\widehat{\mathbf{g}}^n(\alpha^n)=\widehat{\mathbf{z}}^n(\alpha^n)/\widehat{T}^n(\alpha^n),\quad\text{if } t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n,\alpha_k^n=\alpha^n,\end{aligned}$$

and $\left(\widehat{y}^n(\alpha^n),\ \widehat{\mathbf{z}}^n(\alpha^n),\ \widehat{T}^n(\alpha^n)\right)\in\mathcal{S}^n$. By definition of $\mathcal{P}^n$ in Definition 2.2, $(f^n[t],\mathbf{g}^n[t])\in\mathcal{P}^n\subseteq\overline{\mathcal{P}^n},\ \forall n,\ \forall t$.

Since $\overline{\mathcal{P}^n}$ is convex by Lemma 4.1, it follows that $(\mathbb{E}(f^n[t]),\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{g}^n[t]))\in\overline{\mathcal{P}^n},\ \forall n,\ \forall t$. Hence,

$$\left(\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T-1}\mathbb{E}(f^n[t]),\ \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T-1}\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{g}^n[t])\right)\in\overline{\mathcal{P}^n},\ \forall T,\forall n.$$

This further implies that

$$\mathbf{r}(T):=\left(\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T-1}\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(f^n[t]),\ \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T-1}\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{g}^n[t])\right)\in\bigoplus_{n=1}^{N}\overline{\mathcal{P}^n}.$$

By Definition 2.2, $\mathcal{P}^n$ is bounded in $\mathbb{R}^{L+1}$. Thus, $\overline{\mathcal{P}^n}$ is compact and $\oplus_{n=1}^{N}\overline{\mathcal{P}^n}$ is also compact. This implies that the sequence $\{\mathbf{r}(T)\}_{T=1}^{\infty}$ has at least one limit point, and any such limit point is contained in $\oplus_{n=1}^{N}\overline{\mathcal{P}^n}$.

We consider a specific limit point of $\{\mathbf{r}(T)\}_{T=1}^{\infty}$ denoted as $\mathbf{r}^*\in\oplus_{n=1}^{N}\overline{\mathcal{P}^n}$, with the first entry denoted as r_0^* satisfying

$$r_0^*=\limsup_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(f^n[t]).$$

Then, we have the rest of the entries of $\mathbf{r}^*$ must satisfy

$$r_l^*\leq\limsup_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{g}^n[t]),\ \forall l\in\{1,2,\cdots,L\}.$$

Now, by Lemma A.1, we can connect the lim sup with respect to $f^n[t]$ and $\mathbf{g}^n[t]$ to that of $y^n[t]$

and $\mathbf{z}^n[t]$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\limsup_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(y^n[t])\\
=&\limsup_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\sum_{n=1}^{N}(\mathbb{E}(y^n[t]-f^n[t])+\mathbb{E}(f^n[t]))\\
=&\lim_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(y^n[t]-f^n[t])+\limsup_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(f^n[t])\\
=&\limsup_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(f^n[t]).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can show that

$$\limsup_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{z}^n[t])=\limsup_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{g}^n[t]).$$

Thus, by our preceeding assumption that the algorithm under consideration achieves the optimality of (1)-(2), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
r_0^*&=\limsup_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(y^n[t])=f^*\\
r_l^*&\le\limsup_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}(z_l^n[t])\le d_l,\ \forall i\in\{1,2,\cdots,L\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Overall, we have shown that $\mathbf{r}^*\in\oplus_{n=1}^{N}\overline{\mathcal{P}^n}$ achieves the optimality of (1)-(2), and the first part of the lemma is proved.

To prove the second part of the lemma, we show that any point in $\otimes_{n=1}^{N}\mathcal{P}^n$ is achievable by the corresponding time averages of some algorithm. Specifically, consider the following class of *randomized stationary algorithm*: For each system n, at the beginning of k-th frame, the controller independently chooses an action α_k^n from the set $\mathcal{A}^n$ with a fixed probability distribution.

Thus, the actions $\{\alpha_k^n\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ result from any randomized stationary algorithm is i.i.d.. By the renewal property of each system, we have

$$\left\{\left(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n}y^n[t],\ \sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n}\mathbf{z}^n[t],\ T_k^n\right)\right\}_{k=0}^{\infty},$$

is also an i.i.d. process for each system n. Furthermore, it is obvious that for any point $(y,\mathbf{z},T)\in\mathcal{S}^n,\ n=1,2,\cdots,N$, where $\mathcal{S}^n$ defined in Definition 2.2 is the convex hull of

$$\left\{\left(\widehat{y}^n(\alpha^n),\ \widehat{\mathbf{z}}^n(\alpha^n),\ \widehat{T}^n(\alpha^n)\right),\ \alpha^n\in\mathcal{A}^n\right\},$$

there exists a probability distribution on $\mathcal{A}^n$ such that the one-shot expectation of the randomized stationary algorithm on system n with this distribution satisfies:

$$\left(\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n}y^n[t]\right),\ \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n}\mathbf{z}^n[t]\right),\ \mathbb{E}(T_k^n)\right)=(y,\mathbf{z},T).$$

Thus, by definition of $\mathcal{P}^n$ in Definition 2.2, any $(\overline{f}^n, \overline{\mathbf{g}}^n) \in \mathcal{P}^n$ can be written as $(\overline{f}^n, \overline{\mathbf{g}}^n) = (y/T, \mathbf{z}/T)$, where $(y, \mathbf{z}, T) \in \mathcal{S}^n$. Thus, it is achievable by the ratio of one-shot expectations from a randomized stationary algorithm, i.e.

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n} y^n[t]\right)}{\mathbb{E}\left(T_k^n\right)} = \frac{y}{T} = \overline{f}^n, \quad \frac{\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n} \mathbf{z}^n[t]\right)}{\mathbb{E}\left(T_k^n\right)} = \frac{\mathbf{z}}{T} = \overline{\mathbf{g}}^n.$$

Now we claim that for $y^n[t]$, $\mathbf{z}^n[t]$ and T_k^n result from the randomized stationary algorithm,

$$\lim_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E}(y^n[t]) = \frac{\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n} y^n[t]\right)}{\mathbb{E}\left(T_k^n\right)}, \tag{34}$$

$$\lim_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{z}^n[t]) = \frac{\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n} \mathbf{z}^n[t]\right)}{\mathbb{E}\left(T_k^n\right)}. \tag{35}$$

We prove (34) and (35) is shown in a similar way. Consider any fixed T, and let τ be the first renewal after T. Then, from Section B, τ is a valid stopping time on the renewal grid $k = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$, with respect to the filtration $\{\mathcal{F}[t_k^n]\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$. We write

$$\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E}(y^n[t]) = \frac{1}{T}\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{k=0}^{\tau}\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n} y^n[t]\right) - \frac{1}{T}\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t=T}^{t_\tau^n-1} y^n[t]\right). \tag{36}$$

For the first part on the right hand side of (36), since $\left\{\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n} y^n[t]\right\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ is an i.i.d. process, by Wald's equality (Theorem 4.1.5 of [7]),

$$\frac{1}{T}\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{k=0}^{\tau}\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n} y^n[t]\right) = \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n} y^n[t]\right)\cdot\frac{\mathbb{E}(\tau)}{T}.$$

By renewal reward theorem (Theorem 4.4.2 of [7]),

$$\lim_{T\to\infty}\frac{\mathbb{E}(\tau)}{T} = \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}\left(T_k^n\right)}.$$

Thus,

$$\lim_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T}\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{k=0}^{\tau}\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n} y^n[t]\right) = \frac{\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}_k^n} y^n[t]\right)}{\mathbb{E}\left(T_k^n\right)}.$$

For the second part on the right hand side of (36), by Assumption 2.2,

$$\left|\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t=T}^{t_\tau^n-1} y^n[t]\right)\right| \le y_{\max}\cdot\mathbb{E}(t_\tau^n - T) \le \sqrt{B}y_{\max},$$

which implies $\lim_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T}\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t=T}^{t_\tau^n-1} y^n[t]\right) = 0$. Overall, we have (34) holds.

To this point, we have shown that for any $(\overline{f}^n, \overline{\mathbf{g}}^n) \in \mathcal{P}^n$, $n \in \{1, 2, \cdots, N\}$, there exists a randomized stationary algorithm so that

$$\lim_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\mathbb{E}(y^n[t]) = \overline{f}^n, \quad \lim_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{z}^n[t]) = \overline{\mathbf{g}}^n,$$

for any $n \in \{1,2,\cdots,N\}$. Since f^* is the optimal solution to (1)-(2) over all algorithms, it follows for any $(\overline{f}^n, \overline{\mathbf{g}}^n) \in \mathcal{P}^n$, $n \in \{1,2,\cdots,N\}$ satisfying $\sum_{n=1}^N \overline{g}_l^n \leq d_l$, $\forall l \in \{1,2,\cdots,L\}$, we have $\sum_{n=1}^N \overline{f}^n \geq f^*$. Since $\otimes_{n=1}^N \overline{\mathcal{P}^n}$ is the closure of $\otimes_{n=1}^N \mathcal{P}^n$, the same conclusion holds for any $(\overline{f}^n, \overline{\mathbf{g}}^n) \in \overline{\mathcal{P}^n}$, $n \in \{1,2,\cdots,N\}$ and we finish the proof. □

Appendix B: Stopping time and σ-algebra.

Definition B.1. *Given a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ and a filtration $\{\varnothing, \Omega\} = \mathcal{F}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{F}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{F}_2 \cdots$ in $\mathcal{F}$. A stopping time τ is a random variable such that for any $t \in \mathbb{Z}^+$,*

$$\{\tau = t\} \in \mathcal{F}_t,$$

i.e. the stopping time occurring at time t is contained in the information up to time t.

By this definition, it is easy to see that $\{t_k^n\}_{k=0}^\infty$ is a sequence of stopping times satisfying $t_k^n < t_{k+1}^n$, $\forall k$. Then, using the definition of stopping time σ-algebra in [7], we can define $\mathcal{F}[t_k^n]$ as *the collection of all sets A in $\mathcal{F}$, such that $A \cap \{t_k^n \leq t\} \in \mathcal{F}[t]$*. Since $t_k^n < t_{k+1}^n$, $A \in \mathcal{F}[t_k^n]$ implies

$$A \cap \{t_{k+1}^n \leq t\} = A \cap \{t_k^n \leq t\} \cap \{t_{k+1}^n \leq t\} \in \mathcal{F}[t].$$

Thus, $A \in \mathcal{F}[t_{k+1}^n]$, which implies $\mathcal{F}[t_k^n] \subseteq \mathcal{F}[t_{k+1}^n]$, $\forall k$, and $\{\mathcal{F}[t_k^n]\}_{k=0}^\infty$ is indeed a valid filtration. Furthermore, for any adapted process $X^n[t]$ with respect to $\mathcal{F}[t]$[3], $X^n[t_k^n]$ is also measurable with respect to $\mathcal{F}[t_k^n]$.

Proof of τ in Lemma 4.5 is a stopping time:. Indeed, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, and ant $t \in \mathbb{Z}^+$,

$$\{\tau = k\} \cap \{t_k^n \leq t\} = \{t_k^n > T\} \cap \{t_{k-1}^n \leq T\} \cap \{t_k^n \leq t\}. \tag{37}$$

Consider two cases as follows:

1. $t \leq T$. In this case, the set (37) is empty and obviously belongs to $\mathcal{F}[t]$.
2. $t > T$. In this case, we have $\{t_k^n > T\} \cap \{t_k^n \leq t\} = \{T < t_k^n \leq t\} \in \mathcal{F}[t]$ as well as $\{t_{k-1}^n \leq T\} \in \mathcal{F}[T] \subseteq \mathcal{F}[t]$. Thus, the set (37) belongs to $\mathcal{F}[t]$.

Overall, we have $\{\tau = k\} \cap \{t_k^n \leq t\} \in \mathcal{F}[t]$, $\forall t \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Thus, $\{\tau = k\} \in \mathcal{F}[t_k^n]$ and τ is indeed a valid stopping time with respect to the filtration $\{\mathcal{F}[t_k^n]\}_{k=0}^\infty$. □

The following theorem tells us a stopping time supermartingale is still a supermartingale.

Theorem B.1 (Theorem 5.2.6 in [7])**.** *If τ is a stopping time and $Y[k]$ is a supermartingale, then $Y[k \wedge \tau]$ is also a supermartingale, where $a \wedge b \triangleq \min\{a, b\}$.*

References

[1] Altman, E. (1999). *Constrained Markov decision processes.* Chapman and Hall/CRC Press.

[2] Bertsekas, D. (2009). *Convex Optimization Theory.* Athena Scientific.

[3] Bertsekas, D. P. (2001). *Dynamic Programming and Optimal Control, 2nd edition, Vol. I.* Athena Scientific, Nashua, NH.

[4] Bertsekas, D. P. and Tsitsiklis, J. N. (1997). *Parallel and Distributed Computation: Numerical Methods.* Athena Scientific, Nashua, NH.

[3] Meaning $X^n[t]$ is measurable with respect to $\mathcal{F}[t]$ for any $t \in \mathbb{Z}^+$.

[5] Boyd, S. and Vandenberghe, L. (2004). *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University Press.
[6] Byod, S., Ghosh, A., Prabhakar, B. and Shah, D. (2006). Randomized gossip algorithms. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking* **14,** 2508-2530.
[7] Durrett, R. (2013). *Probability: Theory and Examples, 4th edition*. Cambridge University Press.
[8] Fox, B. (1966). Markov renewal programming by linear fractional programming. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics* **14,** 1418-1432.
[9] Gandhi, A., Doroudi, S., Harchol-Balter, M. and Scheller-Wolf, A. (2013). Exact analysis of the M/M/k/setup class of Markov chains via recursive renewal reward. *Proc. ACM Sigmetrics* 153-166.
[10] Li, C. and Neely, M. J. (2014). Solving convex optimization with side constraints in a multi-class queue by adaptive $c\mu$ rule. *Queueing System* **77,** 331-372.
[11] Neely, M. J. (2010). *Stochastic Network Optimization with Application to Communication and Queueing Systems*. Morgan & Claypool.
[12] Neely, M. J. (2012). Asynchronous Scheduling for Energy Optimality in Systems with Multiple Servers. *Proceedings of 46th Annual Conference on Information Sciences and Systems (CISS)*.
[13] Neely, M. J. (2012). Asynchronous Control for Coupled Markov Decision Systems. *Information Theory Workshop (ITW)*.
[14] Neely, M. J. (2013). Dynamic Optimization and Learning for Renewal Systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* **58,** 32-46.
[15] Peng, Z., Xu, Y., Yan, M. and Yin, W. (2016). ARock: an Algorithmic Framework for Asynchronous Parallel Coordinate Updates. *To appear in SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*.
[16] Ross, S. (2002). *Introduction to Probability Models, 8th edition*. Academic Press.
[17] Schaible, S. (1983). Fractional programming. *Zeitschrift fur Operations Research* **27,** 39-54.
[18] Srivastava, K. and Nedic, A. (2011). Distributed Asynchronous Constrained Stochastic Optimization. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing* **5,** 772-790.
[19] Wei, X. and Neely, M. J. (2015). Data Center Server Provision: Distributed Asynchronous Control for Coupled Renewal Systems. *ArXiv preprint arXiv:1512.01609*.
[20] Yao, D. D. (2002). Dynamic Scheduling via Polymatroid Optimization. *Proceeding Performance Evaluation of Complex Systems: Techniques and Tools* 89-113.